



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,918	01/11/2002	Ramesh Pendakur	ITL.2096US (P11552)	7242
47795	7590	10/26/2009	EXAMINER	
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. 1616 S. VOSS RD., SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631			LI, GUANG W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2446	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/26/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



Art Unit: 2446

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Amendment date 06/18/2009
2. Claims 1-3, 5, 16 and 19-23 are presented for examination.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5, 16 and 19-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:  
Claim 1, line 6, it is suggested that “**such that**” be changed to “configured to provide” for the purpose of clarity.
5. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
7. Claims 2 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2446

8. Claim 2 recites the limitation “the subscription information”, “the content descriptors”, “the aggregated content stream” in lines 2-6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claim 19-23 recites the limitation “the content distributor computer system”, “the plurality of filtering hubs” in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claim 19 recites the limitation “other content provider” in line 3. It is vague and indefinite what are other content provider refers to.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

12. Claims 1-3, 5, 16 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Lang (US 5,983,214).

13. Regarding claim 1, Lang teaches a method comprising:

receiving content (“Extraction means 17 can be coupled with, and receives data stream 15 from, network 3” see Lang: col.6 lines 51-54);

receiving user feedback about categories of content of interest to a group of users (user feedbacks (user #1-3) regarding the content “User feedback response 29 can be active feedback, passive feedback or a combination. Active feedback can include the user's numerical rating for an informon, hints, and indices. Hints can include like or dislike of an author, and informon source and timeliness” see Lang: col.7 lines 39-64; Fig.1 item 5 and 29);

Art Unit: 2446

receiving information from individual users about content of interest to individual users (receiving user subscription and filtering user content desired “The profile and filtering process are very similar for both the community level and the member client level, except that at the community level, the empirical data obtained is for all U who subscribed to M, and not merely an individual U. Other information about the individual U can be used to help the filter” see Lang: col.14 lines 18-31); and

using a two-stage filtering process to select content, such that in a first stage, remote from a receiver, user feedback is used to collect content categories from said content for said group of users (community level content for community user and user feedback about the content “The profile and filtering process are very similar for both the community level and the member client level, except that at the community level, the empirical data obtained is for all U who subscribed to M, and not merely an individual U” see Lang: col.14 lines 24-28; Fig.1 item 27a-d) and, during a second phase, at said receiver, filtering nodes are used to select from within said categories, content of interest to a subset of said group of users (individual filtering instead of community filtering “Other information about the individual U can be used to help the filter, such as what U thinks of what a particular author writes in other Zs that the user reads, and articles that can't be used for the group-level M processing” see Lang: col.14 lines 28-31; Fig.1 item 28a-d).

14. Regarding claim 2, Lang taught the method of claim 1 as described above. Lang further comprising: generating a plurality of user profiles comprising the subscription information; associating the content descriptors with the plurality of user profiles; saving the user profiles generating a plurality of personalized content streams based on the plurality of user profiles by

Art Unit: 2446

dividing the aggregated content stream into the plurality of personalized content streams; and providing the plurality of personalized content streams to the plurality of receiving network nodes (creating community profiles (27a-b) and user profiles (28a-d) and storing the profiles “First adaptation means 30 further can include second adaptation means 32 for adapting at least one of the adaptive collaboration profiles, the adaptive content profiles, the community profile, and the user profile, responsive to at least one of the other profiles” see Lang: col.8 lines 11-28).

15. Regarding claim 3, Lang taught the method of claim 2 as described above. Lang further teaches the generating the plurality of personalized content streams comprises filtering the aggregated content stream by comparing the aggregated content stream with the plurality of user profiles (compare the client profiles with informon content profiles “Each of the examples can be weighted by  $##EQU2##$  Note that the "X" in the above equation may not be a mere multiplication or cross-product, but rather be a method for comparing the similarity between the profiles. Next, the similarity of the member client profiles and informon content profiles can be compared” see Lang: col.19 lines 7-18).

16. Regarding claim 5, Lang taught the method of claim 1 as described above. Lang further comprising providing the plurality of personalized content streams to the plurality of corresponding users (user data streams received from network 3 “Method 200 continues by predicting a community profile (step 215) for each community using first prediction criteria, and predicting a member client profile (step 220) for a member client in a particular community using second prediction criteria. Method 200 also includes a steps of extracting raw informons (step 225) from the data stream and selecting proposed informons (step 230) from raw informons” see Lang: col.11 lines 4-19).

Art Unit: 2446

17. Regarding claim 16, Lang teaches a content delivery system comprising:

a head end to distribute content and to receive user feedback about categories of content of interest to a group of users (user feedbacks (user #1-3) regarding the content “User feedback response 29 can be active feedback, passive feedback or a combination. Active feedback can include the user’s numerical rating for an informon, hints, and indices. Hints can include like or dislike of an author, and informon source and timeliness” see Lang: col.7 lines 39-64; Fig.1 item 5 and 29);

a module to select categories for transmission to a group of users based on said feedback (community level content for community user and user feedback about the content “The profile and filtering process are very similar for both the community level and the member client level, except that at the community level, the empirical data obtained is for all U who subscribed to M, and not merely an individual U” see Lang: col.14 lines 24-28; Fig.1 item 27a-d); and

a receiver including a filter to select content from within said categories of interest to a user of said receiver (individual filtering instead of community filtering “Other information about the individual U can be used to help the filter, such as what U thinks of what a particular author writes in other Zs that the user reads, and articles that can't be used for the group-level M processing” see Lang: col.14 lines 28-31; Fig.1 item 28a-d).

18. Regarding claim 19, Lang taught the content delivery system of claim 16 as described above. Lang further teaches the content distributor computer system comprises one or more of broadcasting networks, local broadcasters, cable providers and operators, satellite service provider, and other content providers (recommendation service “one embodiment of an on-line

Art Unit: 2446

recommendation service uses recommendation filtering and adaptive recommendation profiles to give member clients recommendations on matters as diverse as local auto mechanics and world-class medieval armor refurbishers” see Lang: Col.5 lines 45-51).

19. Regarding claim 20, Lang taught the content delivery system of claim 16 as described above. Lang further teaches the plurality of filtering hubs comprises one or more of head-ends, local broadcasters, local satellite stations, and filtering stations (Information filter apparatus see Lang: col.6 lines 42-50; Fig.1) .

20. Regarding claim 21, Lang taught the content delivery system of claim 16 as described above. Lang further comprising a plurality of receivers, the plurality of receivers comprising multimedia devices, wherein the multimedia devices comprise one or more of a content providing sub-system and a content receiving sub-system (individual filtering module and community filtering module in the information filter apparatus 1 “Other information about the individual U can be used to help the filter, such as what U thinks of what a particular author writes in other Zs that the user reads, and articles that can't be used for the group-level M processing” see Lang: col.14 lines 28-31; Fig.1 items 28a-d).

21. Regarding claim 22, Lang taught the content delivery system of claim 16 as described above. Lang further teaching the content providing sub-system comprises content display computer system (output subsystem “An output subsystem combines the content-based and collaboration-based value functions to generate an output rating predictor of the informon for consideration by the user” see Lang: col.2 lines 50-53).

22. Regarding claim 23, Lang taught the content delivery system of claim 16 as described above. Lang further teaching the plurality of filtering hubs and the plurality of receivers are



Art Unit: 2446

integrated one or more of logically and physically (Apparatus 1 part of computer system 16  
“Apparatus 1 is preferred to be part of computer system 16, although User #1 (5) is not required  
to be the sole user of computer system 1” see Lang: col.6 lines 42-50).

### **Conclusion**

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this  
Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).  
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE  
MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO  
MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after  
the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period  
will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37  
CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,  
however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this  
final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
examiner should be directed to Guang Li whose telephone number is (571) 270-1897. The  
examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30AM-5:00PM(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's  
supervisor, Jeff Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the  
organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2446

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

October 26, 2009

GL

Patent Examiner

/Jeffrey Pwu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit

2446